UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,000	04/07/2006	Norihide Mizoguchi	112780-053	2283
	7590 03/27/200 ELLECTUAL PROPE	EXAMINER		
P. O. BOX 708		LOPEZ, FRANK D		
NORTHBROOK, IL 60065			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3745		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/575,000	MIZOGUCHI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
F. Daniel Lopez	3745		

	F. Daniel Lopez	3745	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ').	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) They are not deemed to place the application in betoexpection.	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially re	adding of simplifying ti	ie issues ioi
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 9.		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>3 and 8</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 4-6</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE B. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under apper and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10.	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	<i>.</i>		
	/F. Daniel Lopez/ Primary Examiner		

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The new issues are "the cutoff state being a state in which flow of pressure oil through the ride control valve to and from the accumulator and the pressure chamber is prevented" (claim 1 line 12-14) and "the communication opening area is relatively small when a load pressure detected by the first pressure sensor is a relatively high load pressure and the ...area is relatively large when a load pressure...is a relatively low load pressure" (claim 1 line 27-14)...

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that claims 5 and 6 are not claiming the same thing, because an increase in load pressure or speed causing a decrease in an upper limit does not mean a decrease in load pressure or speed causes an increase in an upper limit. The upper limit can stay the

The claims use the word "comprising". This means that claim 5 claims in at least one situation an increase in load pressure or speed causing a decrease in an upper limit, and that claim 6 claims in at least one situation a decrease in load pressure or speed causing an increase in an upper limit. Clearly, even if there are some situations where the upper limit stays the same when there's a decrease in load pressure or speed, at some point the upper limit must be increased. Therefore, the 2 claims are claiming the same thing..